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The purpose of this study was to gather data from U.S. schools and colleges of pharmacy (SCOPs) in order to describe policies and procedures used in the operation of teaching award and recognition programs. Specific objectives were: to identify changes over the past ten years, to provide suggested "best practices," and to encourage individual program review. A mail questionnaire was sent to a designated contact at every SCOP in April 2001. Multiple reminders were used in the month of May resulting in a 96 percent response rate with 79/82 institutions providing data. Seventy (89 percent) of the institutions bestow at least one teaching award per academic year. Selection policies and procedures, award types and numbers bestowed, and criteria used are highly variable across SCOPs. Institutions should review their policies and procedures based on the criteria and "best practices" presented.

INTRODUCTION

It has been nearly ten years since Smith gathered the data resulting in the article, "Selecting and Rewarding Best Teachers in U.S. Schools of Pharmacy"(1). However, much has transpired in the recent years regarding the scholarship of teaching and learning. Teaching awards have previously been labeled popularity contests(1), an exercise in public relations, rather than a means to encourage better teaching(2), or in the worst case scenario, the kiss of death to an academic career(3). The latter a potential result of competing priorities, resource considerations, and the relative value of teaching versus research productivity. If these are indeed the case, what can we
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do to address these concerns? Yet, others have pronounced that good programs do exist to recognize teaching excellence. Characteristics of these programs include: a match with institutional mission and values, grounding in research-based competencies and practices, consideration for a wide-range of instructional settings and approaches, reward for both collaborative and individual achievements, self-reflection aspects, a pay-back from award recipients in contributing to others’ development - such as serving on future selection committees or providing mentoring to colleagues, and being open to scrutiny and change(4). Menges contends that an effective teaching awards program will pass three tests(5). The tests and associated dimensions include: (i) selection validity test - accurate selection and representativeness; (ii) faculty motivation test - ensuring incentive value and evidence of increasing motivation; and (iii) test of public perceptions.

In passing these three tests, programs should be able to avoid five frequently encountered problems. The first problem speaks to selection procedures - which can be addressed by having stipulated criteria and formalized selection procedures established and making them explicit and public. The second concern is the popularity contest phenomenon. Tradeoffs must be made regarding how student input is used. That is, teaching is more than classroom performance and number of students taught. Procedures should consider the totality of the teaching enterprise including preparation, risk-taking, and the variety of settings in which teaching and learning take place. Thirdly, competition versus collaboration is a natural outgrowth of individual awards as is a win/lose requirement. Ways must be sought in which collaboration as well as competition can be rewarded. A fourth problem considers the questionable incentives surrounding most teaching award programs; that is, in order for teaching awards to actually encourage faculty to value and improve teaching, they must be future oriented, be perceived as highly valuable, be somewhat difficult to attain, yet realistically available. Finally, consideration must be given to special awards replacing continuing awards; for example, approaches such as adjustments to base salary rather than a one-time cash award.

Having a teaching awards program may allow some institutions to possess a false sense of security regarding how it values and rewards teaching. Or as Menges (5) says, "an awards program does not excuse institutions from weighing teaching appropriately in the faculty reward system." In a national survey of U.S. and Canadian medical schools, it was found that teaching skills were the most important aspect of clinician-educators’ performance when making promotion and tenure decisions; with teaching awards, peer evaluation, learner evaluation, and teaching portfolio the four most important methods for evaluating teaching (6). Wynn stated that it was important to recognize good teaching in order to provide a basis for the motivation to improve both teaching performance and the associated curricular materials to result in positive student outcomes (7). Guidance exists for how to improve teaching award programs and for how to create additional incentives in support and recognition of exemplary teaching (8). Suggestions for improvement center on the selection process, sources of data in the selection process, and the need to provide more and varied recognition. Categories for creating additional incentives include increasing the number of awards, creating teaching communities, developing an academy of distinguished educators, publicizing accomplishments of exemplary teachers, and providing additional resources in support of innovative teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table I. Types of evidence used in selecting award recipients a,b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student ratings of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomination letter or form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum vitae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of support from students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of teaching statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of support from peers/other faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of teaching responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabi or other course materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of support from administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of contributions to promotion of teaching on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of previous rewards or recognitions for teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of professional contributions in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions of innovations in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation of involvement with students outside classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of growth in teaching and self-learning over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of professional development activities in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videotape or other audiovisual material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of professional contributions in disciplinary field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of references who can attest to teaching performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samples of student work or evidence of impact on students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a In descending order of frequency.  
b From Chism and Bender (10).

The membership, organizational affiliation and structure, and goals and activities were profiled for a convenience sample of teaching academies(9). A teaching academy was defined as "a group of faculty who are considered excellent or highly interested in teaching and who have been tapped by their institutions to engage in advocacy, service, or advising on teaching matters." A common goal across the institutions was the desire to foster excellence. It was concluded that teaching academies provide an effective as well as powerful means to improve teaching.

In a study conducted in 2000, Chism and Bender analyzed criteria used in teaching awards and the evidence required of candidates primarily at the campus level for programs that had teaching development programs detailed on the World Wide Web (WWW)(10). They were shocked to find that for half of the awards in their sample, there were no associated criteria or only a global statement regarding the association of the award with teaching excellence. As well, eligibility requirements may have been listed as "criteria" and yet, these factors do not denote teaching excellence. Chism and Bender found that some programs implied that it was obvious what constituted excellent teaching and thus it was unnecessary to provide criteria while some named criteria in almost an apologetic fashion. However, there were programs that did specify criteria and some directed candidates to links on a web page or references to institution-specific documents. The most commonly listed criteria were: content expertise, communication skills, high standards, clear goals, enthusiasm, organization, strategies for student engagement, and focus on higher order thinking skills. For those programs that did seek specific forms of evidence to bestow awards, a variety of forms were sought (see Table I). Based on their findings, Chism and Bender recommended the following: be explicit about criteria, tie evidence to criteria, use an overall system of documentation of teaching performance at the institution, use a scholarly approach to teaching awards, and use both the criteria and evidence to direct efforts toward institutional goals, such as the documentation of teaching(10).
The purpose of this study was to assess and summarize teaching award and recognition programs in the nation's schools and colleges of pharmacy (SCOPs). Specific objectives were to: (i) identify changes over the past ten years; (ii) provide suggested "best practices" based on the literature and the collective wisdom of respondents; and (iii) encourage institutions to review their own programs.

METHODS

A 12-item questionnaire was mailed to a designated contact at every SCOP. The institutions, names and addresses were obtained from the 2000-2001 Roster of Faculty and Professional Staff published by the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy (AACP). Pre-contact occurred with some institutions to identify the best potential recipient of the instrument. The Human Subjects Committee Chairman deemed the project exempt from review.

The instrument contained three analogous items to those included in a previous survey of SCOPs(1) and nine additional items. The questionnaire consisted of forced choice, fill-in, and open-ended items. The instrument was assessed for the four sources of error common to survey research(11). Coverage and sampling error were controlled for by striving for a census rather than a sample and thus included the entire population (or nearly so) of institutions. Measurement error was addressed through pre-testing the instrument. As well, the factual versus attitudinal nature of the items requested, should result in higher reliability and validity. Non-response error was addressed by using multiple reminders.

The mailing was sent via first-class mail on April 11, 2001. The cover letter explained the purpose of the study and asked subjects to send additional materials such as award announcements, call for nominations, policies, procedures, criteria, and the like, that would augment data collection. A self-addressed, postage-metered envelope was also enclosed with the instrument. Telephone and e-mail reminders were used in the month of May. In some cases, replacement instruments were faxed to program contacts.

RESULTS

Seventy-nine (96 percent) of the 82 SCOPs responded to the request to provide data. Seventy (89 percent) of the institutions bestow at least one teaching award per academic year. Six of the nine schools with no teaching awards program are currently investigating the possibility of implementing such a program for reasons including: program assessment planning identified this need, faculty and students would like to recognize faculty who are outstanding teachers, the school is looking for guidance in developing objective criteria for selection of recipients, the school is awaiting approval from the university, and the desire to recognize teaching excellence as a scholarly endeavor. Three institutions have no plans to institute a teaching award program with several mentioning the fear of creating a competitive system to recognize faculty and/or the lack of objective criteria available thus potentially resulting in the "popularity contest" phenomenon. One respondent indicated in the comments section that, "many of the faculty believe this to be a personality contest without much thought given to the process." One institution reported that no awards were presented during the 2000-2001 academic year in that the four awards that had been bestowed for the past 25 years were under review and several others indicated that selection processes were being modified.

Approximately half of the institutions use no explicitly stated criteria in the selection process with honorees being selected by student vote using a ballot containing a list of faculty names. Another one-third list the desired qualities in recipients- varying from a sentence to 19 questions posed for consideration. Several categories were prevalent including presentation skills, preparation, enthusiasm, content expertise, strategies for student engagement, and concern for students. Some unique considerations were impact on students, innovation, professionalism, and commitment to the organization. See Appendix A for categories/criteria used. One institution is attempting to incorporate the seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education(12) in the selection criteria. That is, students are asked to consider whether teachers encouraged cooperation among students, encouraged active learning, gave prompt feedback, communicated high expectations, and respected different learning styles and talents in addition to dedication and accessibility. One school has the unique criterion of "improvement over previous years in evaluations" in the selection of the "Teacher of the Year."

Twenty percent of institutions reported that at least one award type required a portfolio submission, the majority of which had stipulated components and sections. These evidence-based awards disseminate specific guidelines and forms for completion to nominators, nominees, and/or applicants. Suggested items and formats for evidence-based awards are listed in Appendix B.

Selection procedures ranged from student vote with no formal nomination procedure to formal nominations required with the determination made by an official committee. When selection committees were used, they varied widely; from student council, faculty affairs committee, alumni, administrative management team, or some combination of these parties. One institution uses the College Curriculum Committee and another has a unique approach where the selection committee consists of the past three recipients (chaired by the one with the longest tenure on the committee), two students from the Dean's Advisory Council, and one graduate student. Past recipients were sometimes called upon to sit on selection committees and provide mentoring to others. In some instances student groups such as Academy of Students of Pharmacy, Student Council, Rho Chi, Phi Lambda Sigma, or professional fraternities conducted the nominations and elections.

The awards were typically bestowed at graduation convocation or an honor's convocation and ranged from the honor of being named; a certificate or plaque; miscellaneous gifts (e.g., marble apple, crystal clock, crystal vase, gift certificate, painting); money ($1,000 to $2,000) deposited in a discretionary account; participation in the hooding ceremony for graduates or speaking at commencement; an honorarium; travel support to attend the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy Annual Meeting; or in many cases, a combination thereof. Honoraria were bestowed by 30 institutions with amounts ranging from $300 to $5,000, with $1,000 the modal amount. One institution even provides marked parking places to its award recipients. About a third of the respondents bestow one award, another third give two to four awards, and the remaining third, five or more teaching awards per academic year. Limits on how often an individual may receive an award are imposed at 26 institutions with restrictions ranging from only being allowed to receive an award once to "sitting-out" from one to five years. Eleven schools have awards endowed and several more indicated plans to seek endowments. Benefactors...
were primarily alumni. Half of the institutions with awards' programs have permanent plaques commemorating past recipients.

Of the 64 institutions indicating that there are university-wide teaching awards for which pharmacy faculty are qualified, 55 have had faculty receive these honors. Some of these awards are based on all-around excellence; that is, teaching, research, and service. In some instances, the SCOP is guaranteed to have recipients each year whereas this is not the case in others. Collaborative achievements are recognized at one institution where a teaching team of the year award is provided in addition to teacher of the year, for each of the four years of the professional curriculum. One school reported that they had previously conducted a teaching portfolio competition several years ago and there were plans to re-institute this and other efforts related to the development of teaching skills. Although data were not specifically requested on teaching and learning grant initiatives, several respondents provided information in this regard as they viewed these as awards for teaching.

Sixteen institutions specifically described teaching awards for preceptors. Ten of these named one preceptor of the year, five named an institutional and a community preceptor of the year, and one selected four preceptors of the year based on geographic region. These awards typically consisted of a plaque and selection of the winner was usually by student vote. In some instances, an experiential program advisory committee named the recipient. It is unknown if other institutions provide teaching awards for preceptors but simply did not consider them a part of their teaching awards program and thus did not provide the information in this data collection. As well, some institutions specified the Roche Laboratories Inc. award for preceptors whereas others did not. The Professional Relations Department at Roche sends a letter to Deans at all SCOPs each spring and provides an engraved plaque for the "Preceptor of the Year" named by the school.

The most prevalent award title was "Teacher of the Year" with some variations such as Best Teacher of the Year, Instructor of the Year, Mentor of the Year, Outstanding Teacher, Outstanding Professor, TOPS (Teacher of Pharmacy School), Golden Mortar and Pestle Award, and the Golden Apple Award. These awards were generally determined by student vote. Some schools bestow one of these awards for the entire school or college, one per department, or one per professional year class each academic year. Award titles such as President's Award or Dean's Award for Distinguished Teaching, Award for Excellence in Teaching, Distinguished Educator, or Awards named for alumni or former faculty members were almost always associated with a formal nomination procedure, selection committees, and evidence-based criteria. Unusual award names and types included: Student Enrichment Award - active with students outside classroom, Faculty Instructional Innovations, Developing Teacher - for teaching excellence demonstrated by a junior faculty member. One institution bestows four awards per year: Excellence in Classroom Teaching, Excellence in Individual Teaching, Excellence in Innovative Teaching, and Excellence in Service to Students.

Approximately one-quarter of the institutions have recognition programs in place to acknowledge a job well done - in this case teaching. These included spotlights in campus newsletters, school newsletters, bulletin board displays, web page articles, university teaching magazines, alumni bulletins, and recognition at President's town hall meeting. In one school, the Dean sends congratulatory letters to faculty receiving the highest ratings on instructor evaluations. One respondent replied that "in the process of answering this survey, I have found that our institution lacks recognition programs - which could provide motivation and incentive for faculty." Two respondents indicated that there was not enough recognition and celebration of teaching award recipients.

Thirty-two SCOPs indicated that their faculty qualified for campus programs dedicated to both recognizing teaching excellence as well as continued development of teaching skills. Seemingly, some of the respondents were reporting on traditional faculty development opportunities, but some specifically described teaching academies and societies and master teacher programs. The Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) online Faculty Handbook describes the Board of Visitors Teaching Fellowships. As well VCU has "VCU Teaching," one of the first university teaching periodicals in the country. One school reported on a Health Sciences Campus Distinguished Educators Academy. The Academy was established to: (i) honor and reward excellence in teaching; (ii) recognize and enhance teaching at all levels; (iii) create a core of outstanding faculty who can inspire and enable other faculty; (iv) serve as an advisory group to the Chancellor; (v) organize seminars and workshops on teaching effectiveness; (vi) foster research on the scholarship of teaching and learning; (vii) advise the institution on teaching policies and practice; and (viii) serve as teaching mentors for new faculty members. The Academy has members from each college based on total numbers of faculty. The appointment is for three years and members receive $5,000/year extra pay. Re-appointments are possible.

The inVISIBLE College is described on the Ellbogen Center for Teaching and Learning web page at the University of Wisconsin (UW). Twenty-six university faculty members met regularly in the inaugural year to read and discuss a common set of books and articles and implement a teaching and learning inquiry. The group was assembled to create and maintain a high profile, inquiry-oriented faculty development program to foster the renewal of teaching and learning at department, program, and college levels. In a related initiative, the UW joined the American Association for Higher Education's Campus Conversations program (http://aahe.ital.utexas.edu). This web site provides reports regarding the conversations taking place at a wide variety of institutions. Several institutions reported interdisciplinary teaching fellow programs where fellows are selected based on an application procedure, are required to participate in a series of meetings throughout the year, and complete a project and present results. The Medical University of South Carolina Apple Tree Society has the mission statement "seeks to foster dialogue and activity related to the scholarship of health professions teaching through campus and national partnerships" (http://musc.edu/appletree). The society has five working groups to accomplish the following goals: expand the faculty development opportunities related to teaching on campus, initiate programs that recognize and enhance the value of teaching as a scholarly activity, explore and support innovative methods and technologies for teaching and learning, and promote professional development of current and future educators. The University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences has a Teaching Scholars Program with two scholars per year from the College of Pharmacy participating in a two-year development program, with didactic and developmental activities (http://www.uams.edu/teachingscholars/Homepage.htm).
DISCUSSION

It is difficult to contrast results with the Smith study, which had a 63 percent response rate, making it impossible to know the status of teaching awards at the non-respondent SCOPs at that time(1). Though four of the institutions that had no college/school level award ten years ago now do. Dossier consideration and use of other evidence-based criteria are now more prevalent in selecting award recipients, as is selection by committees and by procedures other than simple student vote. However, similar to what Chism and Bender found, about half the programs use no explicitly stated criteria and another one-third simply list desired qualities to consider in selecting awardees(10). Some simply state "excellence in teaching" whereas others go on to indicate how that excellence is discerned.

Teacher-of-the-Year awards where student ballot determined the recipient still constitutes the sole teaching award type in some institutions. However, in some SCOPs these awards are not even recognized and/or sanctioned by the administration. That is, they are controlled and bestowed by specific student groups in some instances. One college indicated that in addition to the official "Outstanding Professor" award ($1,500, plaque, designation as "Outstanding Professor in the College of Pharmacy) bestowed each year to one individual based on a competitive review of credentials, that each class picks a "favorite professor" - named at the annual Student Awards banquet, where the recipients receive a plaque. This last piece of information was seemingly provided as an after thought. This disparity among institutions causes confusion as to what a "teacher-of-the-year award" actually means. Therefore, based on local practices, administrators and faculty members may inappropriately evaluate the significance and importance of awards at other institutions. This could be important when serving as an external evaluator in promotion and tenure reviews or in reviewing applicants for faculty positions. Several institutions indicated that they were in the midst of reviewing their policies and procedures surrounding teaching awards and were seeking guidance in their review. How many institutions would "pass" the tests of: (i) selection validity; (ii) faculty motivation; and (iii) public perceptions when evaluating their programs?(5).

Teaching awards are instituted for three main reasons - "institutions hope to symbolically acknowledge their support for teaching, recognize the accomplishments of excellent teachers, and encourage other faculty to achieve similar levels of performance in teaching"(10). Some institutions may specifically wish to incorporate the student voice in making these selections. Thus, the purposes may influence the method of selection. The effects of teaching awards "have not been rigorously assessed"(10). Yet it has been found that teaching academies improve education, thus if award winners "give back" in some way through teaching academies or some other form of mentoring activities, learning outcomes should improve as a result of award programs.

Institutions are not identified (unless materials were discerned from the WWW) as confidentiality was guaranteed to all respondents and in fact, specifically requested by some. It is unfortunate that some cannot be specifically recognized for their policies, procedures, and innovations. Perhaps their reward is the potential betterment of all programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Institutions should evaluate nomination procedures, criteria development and dissemination, selection procedures, award types, and numbers of awards available and apply the Menges' tests in order to avoid the five problems frequently encountered in teaching awards programs(5). Disclosure and openness regarding policies and procedures should reign. Criteria should relate to evidence such that awards are bestowed with thought. Input should be gathered from a variety of audiences including peers, administrators, students, and candidates themselves(8). If portfolio or other evidence-based approaches are not employed, at least formal nominations procedures should be entertained with criteria provided to potential nominators - versus simply circling names on ballots. Colleges and schools should also nominate their faculty members for university-level awards.

Best practices currently applied in SCOPs include: (i) the stipulation on nomination forms as to deadlines, award criteria, eligibility, selection process, and what the award consists of; (ii) established selection committees with diverse representation; (iii) a variety of awards for different kinds of teaching settings, activities, and audiences; (iv) recognition and celebration of teaching success; (v) support for innovation via funding; (vi) reward for collaborative and individual achievements; and (vii) formation of teaching academies.

When evaluating candidate dossiers for promotion and tenure, external reviewers should be made aware of policies and procedures surrounding teaching awards in order to appropriately value this type of recognition. The institution's system for documenting teaching activities and outcomes should inform the award programs and vice versa.

CONCLUSION

Teaching excellence should be recognized and rewarded. To do so requires thoughtful deliberations, creation and implementation of policies and procedures, and resources. Recognition and celebration of excellent teachers can and should elevate the teaching mission in educational institutions. It is hoped that the results of this study will enable those SCOPs without teaching award and recognition programs to initiate such programs and allow others to review and improve their current initiatives with the ultimate goal of exemplary teaching resulting in improved student and programmatic outcomes.
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APPENDIX A. CRITERIA USED IN SELECTING TEACHING AWARD RECIPIENTS

- Presentation clarity, creating student interest, theory-practice link, intellectual challenge, logical approaches, critical evaluation
- General concern for students, active in school's community, approachable in and out of the classroom, goes the extra mile (beyond what is asked of them), innovative in the classroom, organized in the classroom, communication skills (in and out of the classroom)
- Class material is presented in an understandable manner and its usefulness is explained, when possible - innovative teaching methods are employed, students are motivated to excel both academically and professionally, the person is a valuable resource for advising/counseling, the person participated in extracurricular activities
- Faculty who have demonstrated genuine leadership, true professionalism, a sincere interest in students, and have the ability to communicate to and with students
- Faculty member who contributed most to the class learning
- Instruction: effectiveness in fostering learning through lecture, laboratory, recitation, discussion, preceptorial, independent study or research, and other teaching opportunities. Instructor-student rapport: ability and enthusiasm to respect and encourage students and foster their professional growth, and be reasonably available for individual counsel. Teaching-related activities: academic and professional advising, curricular and course revision and innovation, dedication of time and effort to teaching and supervision or promotion of informal professional activities and educational projects
- Excellence in classroom, lab, or clinical teaching
- Excellence in teaching as demonstrated by innovation, teaching philosophy, portfolio, and evaluations by students and peers
- Excellence in teaching and services/support of students
- Concern for learning, encouragement of student participation, stimulate learning, informative, fair, respect, communication
- Instructor who has had greatest impact on education over four years
- Passionate - about teaching and subject matter; flexible - adapts style and schedule to fit current students; clear/organized - material is read to and follows a logical progression; creative/enthusiastic - about their profession/teaching; mentoring - in and outside of the classroom; knowledgeable - in the area they teach and the area of their practice; approachable/responsive - students both in and out of class;

motivating/inspiring - creates desire to learn/understand material; applied teaching to "real life" - relates the topic to students and the profession of pharmacy
- Questions for Consideration: The instructor - presented course objectives and subject matter clearly and effectively in a manner you could understand; presented material at an appropriate pace; stayed on schedule throughout the semester and covered material as assigned or planned; was knowledgeable in all areas of the course; was prepared for class; provided useful supplemental material or additional relevant information not found in the textbook; appeared tolerant and sensitive to students' needs and feelings; answered questions in a helpful way; instructor was accessible to students outside of class for individual or group discussions; examinations provided an adequate opportunity for students to show what they had learned; appeared enthusiastic about the class, therefore, made it intellectually stimulating; expected high standards of students' performance appropriate to the subject matter; motivated me to do my best; has respect for students and other faculty members; was active with local, state, or national organizations; participated in SCOP social, academic and professional events; was knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the profession of pharmacy and the future graduates; and as a result of having this instructor, I have a greater appreciation of the subject matter as it is related to pharmacy
- Faculty demonstrate teaching excellence in various ways: mastery of subject material; concern for and interest in students; ability to stimulate and inspire student learning; creative teaching skills and abilities, and teaching strategies that facilitate learning; lasting impact of the instructor's efforts on the students; creates a caring learning environment for students to apply knowledge; assists and encourages students to extend their thoughts and knowledge beyond their expectations; promotes life-long learning
- Outstanding, innovative, and inspirational contributions to student's professional development
- Demonstrated commitment to providing students with a high quality learning experience, maintenance of high scholarly standards for both the rigor of course content and student performance, possession of personal attributes which make the faculty member an effective role model
- Top 20% of student evaluations, favorable peer review, innovative teaching, improvement over past evaluations
- Innovation, positive student response, commitment to teaching
- Knowledge; excellence in teaching; available to students; fair, engaging, stimulating, demanding; community commitment
- Teacher who has had biggest impact on your academic career
- Significant impact on the intellectual and professional development of students; significant contributions to instruction in their field; commitment to the personal and professional needs of students; demonstrated creativity and innovation in instruction; ability to stay current in their scholarship and instructional efforts

APPENDIX B. EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE REQUIRED IN NOMINATION FORMS/ SUBMISSION PACKETS

- Nomination form consists of three categories to present evidence. Organization/ Presentation - Discuss the instructor's ability with regard to course organization, course presentation, teaching techniques, consistency between course material and examination content, clear concept development and any other technical aspects of course presentation; Motivation - Discuss the ability of the instructor to stimulate interest, questions and enthusiasm. Evaluate the instructor in terms of his/her openness to new ideas and current concepts; Impact - Discuss the aspects of the instructor's teaching that you feel have made a significant impact on you
- Nomination form can be completed on-line or hard copy. For Teacher of the Year - teaching occurs whenever learning takes place, therefore, whenever someone facilitates learning that comes under the umbrella of teaching. This greatly expands the
role of teacher beyond simply lecturing. The roles of advisor and mentor are very important aspects of teaching. This interaction generally occurs one-on-one and is more relationship-based, but if learning opportunities exist, it is still teaching. 1) In what settings have you interacted with this nominee? 2) What sets this nominee apart from other teachers? In your response, you competence as an advisor, exhibits the ability to have students learn how to learn and participate in life-long learning; Excellence in promoting the teaching mission of the school - creative curriculum development in content, sequence of may wish to address any or all of the following - unique teaching techniques that are used to encourage student-teacher interaction; availability and accessibility outside the classroom; the relating to students one-on-one; response to student questions; special abilities which promote student learning 3) How will you use the information gained from this nominee in the future?

- Nomination form asks for a brief support of nomination considering the following criteria when selecting Faculty Award for Excellence in Teaching nominee: Excellence in teaching - serves as an appropriate role model (i.e., performs in a manner that students would want to emulate), exhibits ethical behavior in and out of the classroom, develops new skills, and adopts new teaching techniques, courses, or clerkships, challenges students to do their best academically and professionally, demonstrates enthusiasm, demonstrates competence in the classroom, demonstrates content, and evaluation, student development to improve their academic performance, student advising system, student recruitment

- Nominees for a Teaching Excellence Award are asked to complete a questionnaire containing the following items: Student Involvement and Activity - 1) Please indicate the student organization(s) that you were the faculty advisor during the last year, 2) Are you involved in mentoring Special Problem course(s)? Please indicate number of students mentored during the past year, 3) Have you participated in any student activities within the past year? (e.g., International Day, End of the year picnic, ASP Golf tournament, Career Forum, Student Orientation, Clinical Skills Competition, Patient Counseling Competition, Clinics, Brown bags, etc.) Teaching Related Professional Activity - 1) Do you have students under you in residency/fellowship/graduate programs or any other postdoctoral training programs? If yes, state how many and your involvement, 2) Are you involved in any professional organizations related to teaching - student activities within the past year? Please list the organizations and indicate if you are an officer, committee chair, members, etc., 3) Have you attended any conventions/annual meetings within the past year that involve teaching or student related activity? If so, which one(s)?, 4a) Have you done any poster presentations related to teaching-student activities within the past year? Please list title(s) and meeting, 4b) Have you been involved in any research projects that deal with teaching-student related activities within the past year? If so, indicate title, 4c) Have you received grants for teaching, practice-oriented projects, or any other projects related to student activity during the past year? 4d) Do you have any publications related to teaching or student activity during the past year? Please indicate title(s) and journal, 5) Please list any awards/honors you have received during the past year, 6) Indicate your involvement in any of the following committees during the past year: College, University, national, others. Summary of Student-Course Evaluations

- Candidate submits package on teaching related activities and a 250 word biographical sketch that highlights their teaching. These essays are posted on bulletin boards around the College

- The recipient of an Excellence in Teaching Award is determined based on a portfolio submission. The following criteria are used: Ability to Communicate Effectively - clarity of oral presentation, organization of presentation content, style of presentation (e.g., enthusiasm, interactive learning techniques, willing to change approaches to meet new situations), stimulation of critical thinking, clearly communicated significance of subject to professional responsibilities, clearly written and communicated objectives, course content consistent with stated objectives; Expertise - contemporary knowledge of discipline, relates course content to real life situations; Evaluation Techniques - evaluation techniques clearly explained, test construction-are exam questions clear?, test consistent with stated course objectives, course assignments - are they appropriate in scope and frequency to support course objectives?, frequency of evaluation consistent with course intensity and objectives?, grading promptness, timely communication of course performance to students; Interpersonal Interactions - mutual respect between students and faculty inside and outside of class, availability, approachability, student rapport, attitude which encourages learning, tolerance for opposing points of view; Overall Learning Experience - short term, long term

- The candidate must submit his or her university professional record and teaching portfolio. Teaching performance must be addressed along the following dimensions: evidence of student learning, instructional design, expertise in content, course management skills, instructional delivery. With respect to the five dimensions, lists of suggested types of evidence are provided. Nominees ranked on each of the following characteristics (all categories may not apply to each candidate): knowledge of curriculum area; teaching and learning skills; commitment to learning, mentoring, preceptoring; professional role model; organization skills; communication skills; outcomes, long term impact; classroom teaching; supervising clinical work of students; student advising; honors or academic societies; guiding theses or dissertations

- Written nomination statement (including self-nominations) for Distinguished Educator Award should be at least one page in length and should include a thoughtful analysis of why the nominee is worthy of the award and how the nominee is unique as an educator. The nominees submit a teaching portfolio detailing the activities and accomplishments for the previous year. The portfolio must include: statement of the nominee's teaching philosophy, student and peer evaluations, courses taught, innovative educational activities; such activities may include but are not limited to: special projects, new courses, new instructional techniques, new assessment techniques, publications related to education, teaching activities in outside organizations.

- Nominees for the Outstanding Teaching Award can address the following factors that demonstrate excellence in instruction in their teaching portfolio: development of courses, curriculum, and instructional methods; student comments that attest to the teacher's ability to stimulate interest and work; involvement with individual student activities; effective and diligent advisement of students in pursuing their chosen academic programs; involvement in extramural student activities; peer evaluation; publication activities related to instruction; involvement with instruction-related committees, grants, etc. The teaching portfolio may not exceed three pages.

- Portfolio may include three "best" syllabi, exams, and handouts/ outlines

- For an award recognizing excellence in all three missions, a one-page statement of academic philosophy is required to frame candidate's commitment to teaching, research, and service. Evidence should be provided which characterizes the achievement of the nominee in teaching such as student and peer evaluations of classroom and laboratory instruction, examples of classroom and laboratory innovation, and previous teaching awards. Evidence should also be provided which characterizes achievement of the nominee in research and scholarship such as publication, professional activities, leadership, meeting participation/presentation, peer awards, grant writing, and collaborative efforts with students and colleagues. This section should not exceed five pages. This section is intended to provide an opportunity for the nominee to creatively summarize contributions which best illustrate or represent the impact of his or her academic philosophy.